

Response to Office Action of October 5, 2005
Serial No. 09/989,898

REMARKS

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 25-31 are pending in the present application. In the Office Action mailed October 5, 2005, claims 25-31 were rejected. Claims 25, 28, and 30 are amended hereby. No new matter is presented.

II. RECORD OF INTERVIEW

The undersigned would like to thank Examiner Alanko for her helpful comments and suggestions during the interview conducted on December 5, 2005.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.133(b), the following description is submitted as a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action. The following statement is intended to comply with the requirements of MPEP §713.04 and expressly sets forth: (A) a brief description of the nature any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted; (B) identification of the claims discussed; (C) identification of specific prior art discussed; (D) identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed; (E) the general thrust of the principal arguments; and (F) a general indication of any other pertinent matters; and (G) the general results or outcome of the interview, if appropriate.

(A) No exhibits were shown or demonstrations conducted.

(B) The pending claims were discussed generally.

(C) No prior art was discussed.

(D) No proposed amendments were discussed.

(E) The principal argument presented was that the specification provides ample support for the claimed subject matter including, but not limited to, pp. 9-10, para. [0036]-[0040].

(F) No other pertinent matters were discussed.

(G) It was agreed that a response would be submitted for Examiner Alanko's consideration, and that Examiner Alanko would reconsider the rejection upon filing the response.

If these statements or any other statements in this document misstate or mischaracterize the interview, the Examiner is asked to bring same to attention of the undersigned.

Response to Office Action of October 5, 2005
Serial No. 09/989,898

III. OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. In particular, the specification is objected to for reciting "the first metal-containing layer being about one half of a desired feature thickness" and "the second metal-containing layer being about one half of the desired feature thickness". As discussed during the telephonic interview conducted on December 5, 2005, the specification includes numerous references to such features. By way of example, and not by limitation, paragraph [0039] on page 10 provides:

FIG. 10 shows an illustrative web having a substrate 1004. Metal foil layers 1002 and 1006 are upon the opposing surfaces of the substrate 1004. The metal foil layers 1002 and 1006 are *each about half the desired foil thickness*, and together add to the foil thickness.

(page 10, para. [0039]) (emphasis added). As another example, the specification refers to "half-thickness trace sections" (p. 10, para. [0040]). Given that the specification provides ample support for the claimed subject matter, it is respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

IV. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH

Claims 25-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, claims 25-31 are rejected as lacking written description support for "the first metal-containing layer being about one half of a desired feature thickness" and "the second metal-containing layer being about one half of the desired feature thickness".

In determining whether the written description requirement has been satisfied, the fundamental factual inquiry is whether the specification conveys with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, applicant was in possession of the invention as now claimed. *See, e.g., Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1563-64, 19 USPQ.2d 1111, 1117 (Fed. Cir. 1991). The subject matter of the claim need not be described literally (i.e., using the same terms or *in haec verba*) for the disclosure to satisfy the description requirement. MPEP 2163.02.

The patent application as originally filed provides ample support for claims 25-31. In particular, the specification provides:

Response to Office Action of October 5, 2005
Serial No. 09/989,898

To achieve a large thickness of conductive metal-containing material in a feature of a product unit process with a liquid-based etch process, *the desired thickness of material for the feature is apportioned to the two opposing surfaces* of an insulating substrate to create a two-part feature, each part of which performs the identical function.

(p. 10, paragraph [0036]) (emphasis added). The apportionment may be equal or unequal, as desired. (p. 10, paragraph [0037]) (emphasis added). As one non-limiting example, paragraph [0039] on page 10 provides:

FIG. 10 shows an illustrative web having a substrate 1004. Metal foil layers 1002 and 1006 are upon the opposing surfaces of the substrate 1004. The metal foil layers 1002 and 1006 are *each about half the desired foil thickness*, and together add to the foil thickness.

(p. 10, para. [0039]) (emphasis added). One advantage of the technique of the present invention is set forth as follows:

While the *half-thickness* trace sections 1015, 1025, 1035, 1045, 1055, 1065, 1065, 1075 and 1085 exhibit some progressive narrowing with increased distance from the substrate 1004, the effect on the cross-section area of these trace sections is significantly less than trace sections made from a full foil thickness.

(p. 10, para. [0040]) (emphasis added).

In view of the cited excerpts, it is respectfully submitted that the subject matter of claims 25-31 is amply described in the specification in such a way to convey reasonably to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Thus, it is submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn.

V. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Claims 25-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicant regards as the invention. In particular, claims 25-31 are rejected for reciting the phrase "a desired feature thickness". Claims 25 and 28 are amended hereby. Amended claims 25 and 28 make clear that the singular functional feature has a desired feature thickness, and that the singular functional feature is composed of a first metal-containing layer and a second metal-containing layer. Accordingly, it is believed that this rejection is now obviated and should be withdrawn.

Response to Office Action of October 5, 2005
Serial No. 09/989,898

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully assert that the various rejections of claims 25-31 as set forth in the final Office Action of October 5, 2005 have been addressed and overcome. Applicants further respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance and request that a Notice of Allowance be issued. If issues may be resolved through Examiner's Amendment, or clarified in any manner, a call to the undersigned attorney at (404) 879-2437 is courteously solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees due, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 09-0528.

Respectfully submitted,



Dana E. Stano
Reg. No. 50,750

Date: December 19, 2005
Wornble Carlyle Sandridge & Rice, PLLC
P.O. Box 7037
Atlanta, GA 30357-0037
(404) 879-2437 (direct)
(404) 879-2937 (facsimile)

Our Docket No.: R029 1559US (38400.0172.2)